

1  
2  
3  
4 E-FILED on 10/28/05  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

In re THE LEISURE CORPORATION,  
Debtor.

No. C-03-03012 RMW  
ORDER DENYING APPELLEES' MOTION  
TO DISMISS APPEAL

THE LEISURE CORPORATION,  
Appellant,

[Re Docket Nos. 33, 45, 46]

v.  
KENNETH H. PROCHNOW, and LAW  
OFFICES OF KENNETH H. PROCHNOW,  
Appellees.

Appellees Kenneth Prochnow and the Law Offices of Kenneth H. Prochnow (collectively "Prochnow") move to dismiss the appeal of appellant Leisure Corporation for failure to prosecute the appeal as previously ordered by this court. For the reasons given below, the court denies the motion.

### I. BACKGROUND

At the hearing on May 13, 2005, the court informed appellant it had until "approximately May 25th to" file its designation of record on appeal, and if the record was not filed "within fifteen days," the court would dismiss the appeal on its own motion. Without any contemporaneous explanation or request for more time, appellant filed its excerpts of the record below on May 31, 2005. Appellant now claims that

1 the record was shipped via overnight courier on May 27, 2005, to the court, and offers copies of the  
 2 shipping labels to support this claim. *See* Appellant's Opp'n, Ex. B. The "Date (OPTIONAL)" field has  
 3 indeed been filled in with "5/27/05" on these labels, *see id.*, though that does not prove the packages were  
 4 given to the courier early enough on May 27th to ensure delivery by the next day, nor does it explain why  
 5 appellant was filing the record at such a late date in the first place.

## 6 II. ANALYSIS

7 A "dismissal for non-compliance with non-jurisdictional bankruptcy rules" is at the discretion of a  
 8 district court. *See In re Fitzsimmons*, 920 F.2d 1468 (9th Cir. 1990); *see also* Fed. R. Bankr. P.  
 9 8001(a) ("appellant's failure to take any step other than timely filing a notice of appeal . . . may" result in  
 10 "dismissal of the appeal"). In *In re Fitzsimmons*, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a district court's dismissal of an  
 11 appeal from a bankruptcy court. *Id.* at 1469-70. The district court based its dismissal of the appeal on the  
 12 following:

13 (1) [Appellant] did not serve the designation of the record for a month, well after the ten  
 14 days provided by Bankruptcy Rule 8006 had expired; (2) [appellant] failed to take prompt  
 15 steps to have the reporter's transcripts prepared; (3) [appellant] failed for two months to  
 16 amend its "slipshod" designation of the record; (4) [appellant] failed to post the necessary  
 consequences of these delays were not purely procedural but that in a bankruptcy case  
 creditors can incur substantial prejudice from delay.

17 *Id.* at 1470-71. The Ninth Circuit also affirmed the district court's finding that the appellant's delays were in  
 18 bad faith. *Id.* at 1475.

19 Here, there is insufficient evidence to classify appellant's delays as actions taken in bad faith. While  
 20 appellant's counsel has caused multiple delays, missed deadlines, and filed eleventh-hour (and later)  
 21 motions, the court will attribute this to sloppiness unless it continues. While *Fitzsimmons* did not set the  
 22 minimum threshold of conduct required for dismissal of an appeal, the court notes that appellant's conduct  
 23 here is less egregious than the conduct at issue in *Fitzsimmons*.

24 The Ninth Circuit has noted that although "the client must accept the consequences of his or her  
 25 attorney's errors," "the sanction of dismissal is a harsh one and . . . its impact will most affect the client, and  
 26 not the attorney who in all likelihood caused the offensive conduct." *Id.* at 1472 n.3. Additionally, while it  
 27 troubles the court to let appellant's appeal go forward despite this court's threat of dismissal for any further  
 28

1 delay, dismissal seems an unduly harsh sanction to impose, particularly now that appellant's brief has been  
2 filed. Prochnow's motion is therefore reluctantly denied.

3 **III. ORDER**

4 For the reasons given above, the court denies Prochnow's motion to dismiss the Leisure  
5 Corporation's appeal from the bankruptcy court.

6  
7  
8 DATED: 10/28/05

/s/ Ronald M. Whyte  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:**

2 **Counsel for Appellant:**

3 Raymond H. Aver ray@averlaw.com

4 **Counsel for Appellees:**

5 Pamela M. Ferguson  
Peter Dixon dixon@ldbb.com  
6 Annie Verdries verdries@lbbslaw.com

7 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for  
8 e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

9

10

11 **Dated:** 10/28/05

/s/ JH  
**Chambers of Judge Whyte**

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28